

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 959

JC 670 288

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES.

BY- FITCH, NAOMI

CALIFORNIA UNIV., BERKELEY

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.44 84P.

DESCRIPTORS- \*JUNIOR COLLEGES, \*COLLEGE FACULTY, TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER RATING, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, EFFECTIVE TEACHING, STUDENT OPINION, CALIFORNIA,

THE MAJOR PORTION OF THIS REPORT CONSISTS OF (1) A SERIES OF EXCERPTS FROM ACCREDITATION APPLICATIONS, PRESENTING POLICIES AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION AT 23 CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES, (2) SAMPLES OF FORMS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION, (3) SAMPLES OF FORMS FOR ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OF TEACHERS, AND (4) SAMPLES OF CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT FORMS. (WO)

ED014959

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

# Evaluation of Instructors

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

**EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS  
IN  
CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES**

**APR 27 1967**

**Submitted to:**

**CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGE  
INFORMATION**

**Dr. J. Chester Swanson  
Professor of Education  
University of California  
Berkeley, California**

**by**

**Mrs. Naomi Fitch  
Director of Occupational Services  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California**

**In partial fulfillment  
of the work for  
242C Administrative Behavior  
and Organization:  
Personnel Administration**

**University of California, Berkeley  
Fall, 1965**

## DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES

### Copy Number

1. Dr. J. Chester Swanson  
University of California  
Berkeley, California
2. Dr. Dale Tillery  
University of California  
Berkeley, California
3. Dr. J. Lamar Johnson  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California
4. Research Library  
California Teachers Association  
Burlingame, California
5. Dr. Burke W. Bradley  
Superintendent-President  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California
6. Mr. Joseph L. Blanchard  
Assistant Superintendent-Vice President  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California
- 7-14 Division Chairmen  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California
- 15-25 Special Requests  
Junior Colleges Participating in Survey  
California
- 26-45 Faculty Senate  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California
- 46-56 Reserved Copies  
Mrs. Naomi Fitch  
San Joaquin Delta College  
Stockton, California

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Evaluation of Instructors in California Junior Colleges. . . . .	1-6
References . . . . .	7-9

### APPENDIX

Excerpts From Accreditation Reports. . . .	1-11
Student Evaluations of Instructors . . . .	12-23
Certificated Personnel Evaluations . . . .	24-41
Evaluation Report on Probationary Instructors. . . . .	42-47
Classroom Visitation Evaluations . . . . .	48-55

# EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

## A COMPLEX PROCEDURE

The assessment of teaching competence is a complex procedure which can result in marked improvement in instruction. The appraisal of instructional effectiveness in California Junior Colleges usually includes a visit or two by an administrator who often considers it a routine chore to evaluate the new instructors.

## DIRECT APPRAISAL PROCEDURES

Eckert (11), in discussing possible approaches to the evaluation of instructional effectiveness, listed four direct appraisal procedures:

- (a) Consideration of study guides, examinations and other materials prepared for teaching purposes;
- (b) Ratings by administrators;
- (c) Student ratings; and
- (d) Evidences of student achievement.

## BASIS OF EVALUATION

It has long been recognized that attempts to evaluate teaching effectiveness have not been satisfactory. Often an administrator, after making one visit to a classroom, will make an evaluation based on the observations of that one session.

## RATING BY STUDENTS

Many administrators in California Junior Colleges are searching for methods of evaluation which will result in improvement of instruction. Recently attention has been turned to the student as the one person who views the teacher in his day to day teaching activities. A few junior colleges in California encourage teachers to use student rating forms similar to "Student Rating of Instructors" adapted from Riley (37), The Student Looks at His Teacher.

## LIBRARY FILE OF RATING FORMS

Some California Junior Colleges maintain a file of student rating forms in the college library from which faculty members may select the rating forms most appropriate for the courses taught. Samples of these student rating forms may be found in the appendix of this report on pages 12-23. Most student rating forms have been used on a voluntary basis and for the improvement of instruction. Instructors are not required to turn over the student rating forms for administrative evaluation.

## LIBRARY FILE OF RATING FORMS - cont.

Although considerable doubt has been expressed concerning students' ability to recognize good teaching, studies made so far have failed to support the contention that these evaluations are related to grades received (4), class size (17), class level (7), or sex (37).

## EVALUATION FORMS USED

Several California Junior Colleges publish their evaluation forms so all instructors may review the items for purposes of self-evaluation.

Some junior colleges have a complete description of the evaluation procedures and forms used included in the faculty handbook.

One junior college includes copies of the evaluation forms in the salary handbook.

## TOP SECRET

Other junior colleges treat their evaluation forms as "top secret" and only after the form has been filled out and the instructor called in for an interview is the form revealed to the panic stricken new instructor.

## FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Follow-up studies are used to obtain evaluative information relating to the effectiveness of instruction. Pace (31) has called the rationale of follow-up studies a significant extension of educational research. Sample follow-up forms may

### FOLLOW-UP STUDIES - cont.

be found in the appendix of this report.

### EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

As part of the application for accreditation junior colleges summarize the procedures used in evaluating the effectiveness of instruction.

The appendix of this study includes excerpts from twenty-three accreditation applications. These excerpts indicate that appraisal is a continuing process. Many colleges invite their instructors to complete self-evaluation forms and to administer questionnaires to discover student attitudes toward effectiveness. Student evaluations are treated as confidential and the results are known only to the instructor who administers the student attitudes questionnaire.

Sample forms for the "student evaluation of instructors" may be found in the appendix of this report, pages 12-23.

The tabulation of student evaluation forms appearing on the next page indicates the type of items used to enable students to evaluate instruction. This tabulation is followed by a tabulation of items used by administrators in evaluating instructors.

STUDENTS EVALUATE INSTRUCTION

in

California Junior Colleges  
(Items Included on Evaluation Forms)

	Number of Schools
Organization of Course Content . . . . .	13
Teaching Methods . . . . .	7
Concern for Student Progress . . . . .	13
Clearness of Examination Questions . . . . .	1
Importance of Examination Questions . . . . .	5
Encouragement of Thinking . . . . .	9
Manner of Speaking . . . . .	10
Ability to Explain . . . . .	15
Attitude toward Subject . . . . .	17
General Rating Compared to all Instructors . . . . .	7
Knowledge of Subject . . . . .	13
Quality of Examinations . . . . .	18
Subject Matter Kept up to date . . . . .	2
Class Management and Discipline . . . . .	6
Personal Appearance . . . . .	4
Sense of Humor . . . . .	6
Level of Standards of Instruction . . . . .	2
Usefulness of Subject Matter . . . . .	6
Interest of Subject Matter . . . . .	8
Quality of Textbook . . . . .	5
Requirement of Course . . . . .	1
Difficulty of Textbook . . . . .	2
Manner of Instructor . . . . .	7
Improvements . . . . .	4
Grading of Instructor . . . . .	3
Good Points of Instructors Teaching . . . . .	4
Preparation for Each Class . . . . .	3
Assignments . . . . .	8
Judgment of Values . . . . .	2
Class Discussion and Questions . . . . .	5
Poise and Self-confidence . . . . .	3
Tolerance . . . . .	3
Grading Methods . . . . .	4
Time Student Spends on Course . . . . .	2
Overall Rating of Course . . . . .	1
Willingness to Accept Different Points of View . . . . .	1
Willingness to Help Students Out of Class . . . . .	1
Recommendation of Class to Others . . . . .	2
Lecture . . . . .	1
Labs . . . . .	1

# ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATE INSTRUCTORS

in

California Junior Colleges  
(Items Included on Instructor Evaluations)

	Number of Schools
Personal Qualities . . . . .	17
Professional Qualities . . . . .	14
Professional Competence . . . . .	11
Overall Effectiveness . . . . .	5
Improvements . . . . .	6
Specific Abilities . . . . .	2
Teaching Technique . . . . .	11
Knowledge of Subject . . . . .	11
Enthusiasm . . . . .	9
Sense of Humor . . . . .	3
Appearance . . . . .	12
Voice . . . . .	9
Organization . . . . .	10
Accuracy and Promptness of Records . . . . .	2
Use of Supplies and Equipment . . . . .	10
Acceptance of Suggestions . . . . .	6
Co-curricular Activities . . . . .	6
Student-Instructor Relationship . . . . .	18
Instructor-Instructor Relationship . . . . .	11
Instructor-Administration Relationship . . . . .	10
Effectiveness of Instruction . . . . .	12
Classroom Management . . . . .	10
Recommended for Re-Employment . . . . .	6
Not Recommended for Re-Employment . . . . .	6
Presentation of Subject Matter . . . . .	10
Health . . . . .	7
Punctuality . . . . .	2
Judgment . . . . .	3
Resourcefulness and originality . . . . .	4
Motivation . . . . .	5
Assignments . . . . .	2
Preparation . . . . .	13
Class Participation . . . . .	4

# REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

1. A.C.E. Cooperation in General Education. The Council, 1947. 240 p.
2. Bloom, Benjamin S. "How May the Special Contributions of Liberal Arts Education Be Evaluated?" In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954. Association for Higher Education, 1954. p. 283-87.
3. Brumbaugh, Aaron J. "Role of Evaluation in the Development and Improvement of Regional Programs of Higher Education." J Exp Ed 25:43-48; 1956.
4. Clark, Kenneth E., and Keller, Robert J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching." In Eckert, Ruth E., and Keller, Robert J. (Eds.) A University Looks at Its Program. U Minnesota, 1954. p. 197-212.
5. Cogan, Morris L. "Theory of Design of a Study of Teacher-Pupil Interaction." Harvard Ed R 25:315-41; 1956.
6. Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improve School Practice. TC, 1953. 161 p.
7. Crannell, Clarke W. "An Experiment in the Rating of Instructors by Their Students." Col and U 24:5-11; 1948.
8. Dressel, Paul L. "Problems in the Evaluation of General Education." In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954. Association for Higher Education, 1954. p. 278-82.
9. Dressel, Paul L., and Mayhew, Lewis B. General Education: Explorations in Evaluation, ACE, 1954. 302 p.
10. Eckert, Ruth E. Outcomes of General Education. U Minnesota, 1943, 210 p.
11. Eckert, Ruth E. "Ways of Evaluating College Teaching." Sch Soc 71: 65-69; 1950.
12. Eckert, Ruth E. "Evaluation in General Education." In General Education 51st Yearbook, Part 1, N.S.S.E. U Chicago, 1952, p. 250-78.
13. Ellis, Walter C. Surveys of American Higher Education. Carnegie Foundation, 1937. 538 p.
14. Eulich, Alvin C. "A Plan of Evaluation for Bennington College." J Ed Res 34: 633-34; 1941.
15. Gustad, John W. "Changes in Social Attitudes and Behavior; A Review of the Literature." Ed Psychol Meas 11: 87-102; 1951.
16. Guthrie, Edwin R. "The Evaluation of Teaching." Ed Rec 30:109-15; 1949.
17. Guthrie, Edwin R. The Evaluation of Teaching: A Progress Report. U Washington, 1954. 18 p.

18. Havemann, Ernest, and West, Patricia. They Went to College. Harcourt, 1952. 227 p.
19. Hollis, Ernest V., and Martorana, S. V. "Advance Planning for Higher Education in the United States." J Higher Ed 12: 101-8; 1956.
20. Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. Edward W. Hazen, 1956. 178 p.
21. Jones, Edward S. Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges. Macmillan, 1933. 436 p.
22. Knapp, Robert H., and Greenbaum, G.G. The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origin. U Chicago. 1953. 122 p.
23. Learned, William S., and Wood, Ben D. The Student and His Knowledge. Carnegie Foundation, 1938. 406 p.
24. Minnesota Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education in Minnesota. U Minnesota, 1950. 419 p.
25. Mueller, Francis J. "Trends in Student Ratings of Faculty." Am Assn U Prof B 37:319-24; 1951.
26. New York University. The New York University Self Study. New York U. 1956. 286 p.
27. Norem, Grant M., and Others. "An Evaluation Schedule for Academic Ranking." Peabody J Ed 28:21041; 1950.
28. N.S.S.E. The Measurement of Understanding. 45th Yearbook, Part 1. U Chicago. 1946. 338 p.
29. Ogan, Ralph (Ed.) A College Looks at Its Program. Muskingum C. 1937. 326 p.
30. Pace, C. Robert. They Went to College. U Minnesota. 1941. 148 p.
31. Pace, C. Robert. "Follow-up Studies of College Graduates." In Growing Points in Educational Research. Official Report, AERA. 1949. p. 285-90.
32. Pace, C. Robert. "How Does an Institution Organize and Conduct an Effective Self-Evaluation?" In Current Issues in Higher Education. 1954. p. 251-59.
33. Reeves, Floyd W., and Russell, John Dale. College Organization and Administration. Disciples of Christ, 1929. 324 p.
34. Reeves, Floyd W., and Others. The University of Chicago Survey. 12 Vols. U Chicago, 1933.
35. Remmers, H. H. (Ch.) "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness." R Ed Res 22:238-63; 1952.
36. Remmers, H. H. (Ch.) "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness." J Ed Res 46:641-58; 1953.

37. Riley, John W., and Others. The Student Looks at His Teacher. Rutgers U, 1950. 166 p.
38. St. Scholastica College. The First Fifteen Years of the College of St. Scholastica. Fordham U, 1947. 184 p.
39. Stern, George G., and Others. Methods in Personality Assessment. Free. 1956. 271 p.
40. Troyer, Maurice E., and Pace, C. Robert. Self Survey; Report to the Faculty. Syracuse U, 1949. 75 p.
41. Woodburne, Lloyd S. "The Qualifications of Superior Faculty Members." J Higher Ed 23:377-82; 1952.
42. Zook, George F., and Haggerty, Melvin E. Principles of Accrediting Higher Institutions. U Chicago, 1936. 202 p.

A

P

P

E

N

D

I

X

EXCERPTS FROM  
ACCREDITATION REPORTS

## EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

### AMERICAN RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

An outstanding faculty, drawn from all sections of the nation through carefully planned recruitment procedures, is considered the primary route to an effective teaching program. Provisions for professional growth, including sabbatical leaves, are also considered an essential part of the effort to achieve instructional objectives. Instructors are encouraged to meet with and exchange ideas and techniques with other specialists in their fields, and such developments as team teaching, closed-circuit television in the science laboratories, foreign language teaching programs such as the "Voix et Images de France," are all in part the outgrowths of continuous professional interaction and planned professional growth activities.

Systematic procedures have been developed for classroom visits by supervisory personnel and for follow-up conferences. Communication among instructors is ensured by frequent and regular meetings of divisions, meetings of division chairmen, curriculum committees, and committees concerned with professional standards. Appraisal is a constant process, and assistance is readily available especially for new instructors who may be in need of help. Particular efforts are made to assist these faculty members, whose classes are visited regularly. Instructors are invited to complete self-evaluation forms and to administer questionnaires to discover student attitudes toward their teaching effectiveness. The latter are treated as confidential, and their results are known only to the instructor.

### BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

Regular visits are made to the classes of probationary instructors by division and department chairmen and the Dean of Instruction. First-year instructors are also visited by the college president and the assistant superintendent of the district. Each of the visits is followed by an interview with the instructor.

Administrative officers are always available to instructors for counsel when the need is felt.

Instructors in a particular department or subject area meet to discuss courses. For example:

Instructors of courses for the nursing students review the content of their courses to avoid overlap or omission.

Instructors in English composition meet regularly to evaluate sample essays. Department examinations are also used in English.

Instructors in mathematics meet to coordinate mathematics classes and to insure common purposes.

Regular meetings are held by instructors in Psychology 1a and in other social science courses taught by more than one instructor.

CABRILLO COLLEGE

Evaluation of faculty members is made by the administrative staff on the following criteria: organization of teaching materials, knowledge of subject, rapport with students, rapport with staff, attention to records, classroom instruction, community relations, and professional growth.

The president and director of instruction visit the classes of all instructors several times each year. Instructors are free to discuss findings with either or both administrators. In April and May of each year an official "Instructor Evaluation" sheet is prepared and discussed with individual staff members.

CHABOT COLLEGE

Instructors are evaluated during their probationary period through many informal contacts, in committee work, and by classroom visitations. Formal classroom visitations are made by the President, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Personnel, Assistant Deans of Instruction, and the Division Chairmen. A brief description of this process follows:

Instructors, probationary and permanent, are visited periodically by a member of the administrative staff during the school year. Following each class observation, a follow-up conference is held. During these conferences, teaching achievements and problems related to these and similar areas are discussed: the class as a whole, individual student progress, planning, class objectives and methodology, curriculum innovations, etc. A Classroom Observation Consultation Form is then filled out in duplicate and signed by the administrator and the instructor. One copy is given to the instructor and one copy is placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append a written statement to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

In addition to classroom evaluations, there are periodic consultations to review faculty progress as described below:

Each full-time instructor, probationary and permanent, participates in a general evaluation conference with a designated administrator at least once a year. In the case of probationary instructors, this conference is held prior to February 15. This general rating conference is concerned with the instructor's effectiveness as a faculty member, both in and out of the classroom, in terms of the criteria underlying District policy. A Periodic Consultation Form is filled out in duplicate and signed by the administrator and by the instructor. One copy is given to the instructor, and one copy is placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append a written statement to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

COALINGA COLLEGE

The evaluation of staff effectiveness is the responsibility of the Superintendent and President. The Administrative Code of the Governing Board of the Coalinga Junior College District provides the rules and regulations under which staff effectiveness is evaluated. Both permanent and probationary teachers are evaluated each year.

COMPTON COLLEGE

New faculty members are evaluated on the basis of effectiveness in the following areas, although not necessarily in the order listed: class performance, professional attitudes and philosophy, the ability to work cooperatively with other members of the entire staff, meeting assigned obligations at specified times.

A procedure exists by means of which department chairmen and the Dean of Instruction visit classes of probationary personnel at least once each semester, rate the personnel visited, and interview them on the basis of the rating sheet. Visitations are designed for the purpose of assisting the faculty member in becoming an effective member of the staff, and all visitations and subsequent interviews are handled in a manner that insures the maximum degree of cordiality and rapport.

COLLEGE OF THE DESERT

Evaluation consists of several procedures including:

Ratings by the department chairmen, the Dean of Instruction, the President of the College.

Ratings by students. This is accomplished by each faculty member on a voluntary basis. No standard student rating form is used. A file of student rating forms is maintained in the library from which faculty members may select those most desirable and appropriate for the courses taught.

Class visits are conducted by the Dean of Instruction, the President of the College, and the department chairmen.

Frequent interviews are held by the Dean of Instruction and the President with individual faculty members to discuss ratings and any other personal or professional matters relating to the effectiveness of the instructor in his assignment.

Informal faculty discussion meetings are scheduled throughout the year to discuss such subjects as grading, very able students, visual aids, class size and teaching effectiveness, etc.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE

The Committee on Curriculum and Instruction has devoted weekly meetings during the 1962 fall semester to the development of a recommended statement of criteria for evaluation. During the 1961-62 academic year each contract instructor was visited at least twice by the Dean of Instruction and a formal report of evaluation was prepared after the second or third visit. The President also visited instructors' classes. Copies of all evaluation reports were forwarded through the President's Office for his additional comment and then a copy was sent to the instructor for his response and return. These reports are on file in the instructors' personnel files. When deemed advisable by the administration or when requested by the instructor, a follow-up interview with the Dean of Instruction or the President was arranged.

During the fall semester of 1962 all new contract instructors were visited at least once, and it is anticipated that formal reports will again be made after the second visit planned for February and March. By 1963-64 this crucial but time-consuming job will be shared with departmental chairmen and perhaps by a new Director of Vocational-Technical Education. It is obvious that as a college grows in size the magnitude of this task also increases; yet there is general agreement that this emphasis on evaluation has contributed toward making the reputation for top caliber teaching in junior colleges a deserved one. Sharing of this task with departmental chairmen also should allow for closer evaluation of the Evening Division instructors which has been less comprehensive so far than it has been during the day program.

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Classroom visits are made by the Vice-President for instruction and the President. Department heads may visit classes, but this is not considered as a required responsibility.

All staff members are urged but not required to use student evaluation as a means of improving instruction. Results of student evaluations are sometimes provided the administration, but only on a voluntary basis.

An effort is made to visit the classes of non-tenured instructors three times per year. If weaknesses are observed, additional visits are made. On the other hand, an instructor who is judged as superior may not be visited that often. An observation form is filled out following classroom visitation and the results are discussed with the instructor.

LOS ANGELES JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Rating Sheet - Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness.

1. Relationships and cooperation: (This refers to tact, sincerity, friendliness, sense of humor, attitude in working with others, willingness to assume and share responsibility.)
  - A. With students.
  - B. With school staff and other personnel

LOS ANGELES JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS - cont.

2. Personal traits: (Appearance, dress, grooming, posture, voice, etc.)
3. Classroom Teaching
  - A. Command of Subject
  - B. Physical Performance
  - C. Organization of Material
  - D. Use of Devices
  - E. Rapport
4. Overall rating - Outstanding, strong, average, weak, unsatisfactory

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE

In conformity with Los Angeles Board of Education Personnel Division requirements, all probationary teachers are evaluated once each semester until they are eligible for tenure.

The evaluation process involves conferences between the deans, department coordinators, and the probationary teachers concerned. Observations made by deans and coordinators, through actual classroom visitations, are an important part of the process. Suggested items for consideration are:

(1) Appearance and grooming; (2) Mental alertness, creative ability and originality; (3) Effectiveness of voice and speech; (4) Ability to express himself orally and in writing; (5) Emotional balance; (6) Health and vitality; (7) Mastery of subject matter; (8) Skill in planning; (9) success in carrying out plans; (10) Attention to fundamental skills; (11) Skill in use of accepted methods and procedures; (12) Provision for individual differences; (13) Skill in growth and achievement, evaluation of pupils'; (14) Skill in classroom management and control; (15) Effectiveness as an inspirational leader; (16) Success in working cooperatively with administrators and supervisors; (17) Success in working cooperatively with parents; (19) Promptness and accuracy in carrying out assigned duties; (20) Punctuality and regularity in attendance; (21) Professional growth; (22) Skill in furthering and safeguarding pupil health; (23) Skill in housekeeping, and in maintaining proper physical conditions in the classroom.

The evaluation report includes: the date of the conference with employee; specific strengths discussed in conference; specific needs discussed and recommendations made for improving services; recommendation for employee to be continued or discontinued in service; and evaluation of the services of the employee as "unsatisfactory", "weak", "strong", or "outstanding".

If it is determined that an instructor is to be rated as "unsatisfactory", a special report is made on a Personnel Division Form 1015-5 Unsatisfactory Notice. The rater, in this instance, must state on this form: "I visited the above employee and observed his work on the following dates" also, the rater must state reasons why he considered the services of the employee to be unsatisfactory for the period indicated.

**COLLEGE OF MARIN**

A system of evaluation of probationary teachers was developed during the 1959-60 and 1960-61 school years and revised several times. Each probationary teacher is evaluated by a committee composed of one administrator (usually the Dean or Assistant Dean of Instruction), the Division Chairman, and the Department Head. The aid of faculty members is requested at times. This committee evaluates the teacher, makes a statement of strengths and weaknesses, and recommends retention or dismissal to the President.

**MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE**

Evaluation consists of several procedures including:

Ratings by the Department Chairmen and the Vice President of the College.

Ratings by students. This is accomplished by each faculty member on a voluntary basis. No standard student rating form is used. A file of student rating forms is maintained in the library from which faculty members may select those most desirable and appropriate for the courses taught.

Class visits are conducted by the Vice President of the college and the Department Chairman.

Frequent interviews are held by the Vice President and the President with individual faculty members to discuss ratings and any other personal and professional matters contributing to the effectiveness of the instructor in his assignment.

Informal faculty discussion meetings are scheduled throughout the year to discuss such subjects as grading, very able students, visual aids, class size, and teaching effectiveness, etc.

**NAPA COLLEGE**

Each year teachers who are not on tenure are rated according to the attached rating sheet. This rating is performed by the President or the Director of the Junior College in conference with the teacher concerned. The teacher has opportunity to make any appropriate comment concerning his rating report. This report is then filed with the District Administration Office.

**OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE**

The Dean of the campus is officially responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of faculty members. In the Oakland City College, however, this responsibility is delegated to the Associate Dean, Administration, at the Merritt Campus, and the Associate Dean, Instruction, at the Laney campus. The Dean and the Associate Dean have a close working relationship in this evaluation process.

OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE - cont.

At the Merritt Campus, an effort is being made to involve department chairmen and permanent members of the teaching staff in some phases of the evaluation process, but as yet, no established procedures have been developed. The Mathematics Department is undertaking a pilot project in this area.

The campus administrator may call upon the services of central office supervisors of instruction to assist in evaluation and in improvement of instructional services.

During the three-year probationary period for certificated staff, annual reports are made to the director of the college and to the director of personnel on forms provided by the district. The Dean and/or the Associate Dean at the campus discuss with the instructor the evaluation which is being submitted, and both the administrator and the instructor sign the report.

Every five years an evaluation report for tenure instructors is submitted by the Dean of the campus to the Director of Personnel through the Director of the city college. When tenure instructors from other schools in the Oakland Unified School District are transferred to the Oakland City College, an evaluation report is submitted at the end of the first year.

A pamphlet, "The Guide for the Evaluation and Improvement of Professional Services", is provided by the Director as the basic device to be used for evaluation of certificated staff.

OCEANSIDE-CARLEBAD COLLEGE

The evaluation of the effectiveness of college staff members is a responsibility of the President and other administrators. A teacher evaluation form is submitted to the Superintendent at the end of each year for permanent personnel and at the end of each semester for temporary employees. These evaluations are the result of class visitations, general observations, and informal student attitudes. The teacher evaluation form is discussed by the President with the instructor concerned before it is sent to the Superintendent.

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE

Evaluation is here defined as a process designed to measure an instructor's effectiveness in dealing with all of his duties and responsibilities. The main purposes of evaluation at Porterville College are: (a) to improve instruction; (b) to make it possible for a teacher to realize his highest potential; (c) to make administrative decisions. Evaluation must necessarily lead to an appraisal of competency. The term "competency" is considered to mean satisfactory service of probationary employees, there are only two degrees of competence: SATISFACTORY or UNSATISFACTORY.

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE - cont.

All instructors are evaluated in several ways in order to determine their effectiveness. In selecting an instrument for administrative evaluation by classroom visitation, several instruments for the evaluation of the quality of instruction were studied. The instrument designed for Porterville College incorporated ideas from the instruments studied, from teacher's rated charts, and from other guides for the evaluation of the improvement of professional services.

The instructors are evaluated by classroom visitations by the Dean of Instruction and by the Director. In these visitations, the instrument is kept in mind and used in the interview with the instructor and in the interview which follows between the Dean of Instruction and the Director. In addition to the use of instruments and classroom visitation, both informal and formal meetings of Instructors, Dean of Instruction, Director, and Department Chairman take place to assist in the improvement of instruction. All instructors utilize student rating forms annually; information is confidential to the instructor, but each instructor submits an anonymous tally report for comparative purposes.

Follow-up studies, student interviews, reports from transfer institution, and interviews with employees of Porterville College Alumni are other methods used in the evaluation for effectiveness of personnel.

REEDLEY COLLEGE

Formal evaluation of teachers is conducted as provided in section 3-112.3 and 3-500 of the Governing Board Policies Regulations Manual. In a small institution with considerable personal interaction, the formal evaluation can often be validated by a more informal situation resulting from the day to day contacts.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE

Final judgment and recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the continued employment of a teacher are made by the President of the college; the Vice-President for Instruction assembles the evidence and makes a recommendation. Effort is made to get all recommendations completed by April 1 of an academic year. In making these recommendations, the following kinds of evidence are used:

At the time of each recommendation, the teacher's total educational preparation for junior college teaching is reassessed. This puts particular attention upon the continuing education that the teacher has sought during the period of his employment by the college.

The vice-president for Instruction arrives at an accumulative judgment of the suitability of the instructor's personality for junior college teaching.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE - cont.

Through conferences, observation of work with teacher groups, and reports from all sources, the Vice-President for Instruction arrives at an accumulative judgment as to the effectiveness of the teacher's class work.

Evidence is assembled as to the amount and quality of the teacher's participation in the non-instructional activities of the college. While these activities are given less weight than teaching effectiveness, they, nevertheless, are considered to be important criteria for selection of new junior college teachers.

Evidence as to the degree of cooperation of a teacher in the various kinds of interpersonal relationships on the campus are assembled.

The Vice-President for Instruction secures reports covering numerous items on the teacher being evaluated from the chairman of his instructional division.

Reports are also secured, in writing, from the Deans, the Director of Counseling, the Director of Extended Day classes, and the College Business Office. All of these are thought of as supplementary evidences collected to help guard against gross mistakes in judgment.

A standardized instrument, developed for securing anonymous student ratings of teachers, is obtained after completion of the first semester. These ratings are analyzed to determine their contribution to the total evaluation of a probationary instructor.

Self-evaluation reports are secured from each instructor being rated. These reports are made to the Vice-President for Instruction on a form supplied by his office. They seek a first-hand statement about the teacher's participation in the activities of the college.

SAN DIEGO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Summarized briefly, evaluation procedures of the District and the College are designed to provide a situation which is conducive to the employment and maintenance of a highly qualified teaching staff. Cooperatively developed, it provides the opportunity for teachers to consciously improve their service to the College as well as the method by which the College can carry forward a continuous program of in-service training to insure control of a high level of quality in its professional staff.

An evaluation report is made twice each year for all probationary teachers and for permanent teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating. A report for all other permanent teachers is submitted once each year. In cases where severance is necessary, District policy is followed. Each evaluation made during the three-year probationary period requires a conference between the Director and the teacher. Both sign an evaluation form at the close of the conference, certifying discussion of the factors involved. Teachers are recommended for tenure after three years of successful teaching experience in the District.

SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

The President as well as other staff members check informally with new personnel to clarify procedures or assist in the solution of problems. The President schedules an individual conference about six weeks into the term to discuss any topic he or the new faculty member wishes to raise. A program of class visitations is carried out by the president with the advance knowledge and agreement of new personnel. A subsequent conference is then scheduled with the faculty member.

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

The Teacher Evaluation form specifies the frequency of submitting the evaluations of each instructor.

The evaluation of instructors at Southwestern College is an attempt to improve the total instructional program. Three evaluations are given first year instructors, two to all other probationary instructors and one to permanent instructors. The primary responsibility for instructor evaluation rests with the Dean of Instruction. However, it has also been the practice of the President to make classroom visits, particularly when there is a reasonable doubt about the effectiveness of an individual instructor. All instructors marked "unsatisfactory" in any area are given individual interviews to review their particular problem. All other instructors have a personal conference with the Dean of Instruction indicating their evaluation.

A student evaluation form is made available and all instructors are encouraged to use the form with their classes. The use is optional and the administration does not request to see the results.

The evaluation of all hourly-rate instructors is jointly shared by the Dean of Instruction, Assistant Dean of Instruction, and by the Division Chairmen. These instructors are rated once during each semester and again they are notified of any inefficiencies that are reported.

VALLEJO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Each faculty member is evaluated at least once each year at a principal-teacher conference which covers all areas of teaching including mastery of subject matter, classroom management, professional interest, and personal characteristics.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS  
OF  
INSTRUCTORS

## STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instructor's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Read the entire sheet BEFORE you mark any response. In the left-hand margin number the items 1, 2, and 3 that you consider to be the three most significant on the sheet. Place a cross (+) at the point on the scale that most accurately represents your considered opinion of each trait. DO NOT sign your name to this paper. Your fair and honest opinion is what really counts, as your instructor desires this rating for his own self-improvement.

_____	KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very well-informed	Well-informed	Limited background	Poorly informed
_____	PRESENTATION	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Stimulating	Adequate	Routine	Dull
_____	ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very considerate	Considerate	Sometimes intolerant	Inconsiderate and rude
_____	EXPLANATIONS	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very clear	Clear	Confused	Faulty
_____	POISE	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Highly poised	Poised	Easily upset	Highly insecure
_____	ORGANIZATION OF COURSE	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Well organized	Organized	Lacks continuity	Confused
_____	ASSIGNMENTS	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very clear	Clear	Indefinite	Very vague
_____	EXAMINATION QUESTIONS	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Clear and relevant	Adequate	Sometimes confusing	Irrelevant and not clear
_____	GRADING METHODS	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very fair	Fair	Inconsistent	Biased
_____	TIME STUDENT SPENDS ON COURSE	( )	( )	( )	( )
		More than any other	More than average	Less than Average	Less than any other
_____	TEXTBOOK VALUE	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Great	Some	Limited	Very little
_____	ATTITUDE TOWARD COURSE	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Very favorable	Favorable	Indifferent	Negative

CHABOT COLLEGE**STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR**

Please evaluate your instructor on the attributes listed below. Since no names are placed on these pages complete anonymity is insured. Feel free to express your opinion frankly. At the same time, since your instructor is interested in improving his instructional techniques and has volunteered to this survey, it is to the advantage of all to evaluate as fairly and objectively as possible.

You should bear in mind other college teachers you have known (in required courses as well as elective courses or courses in your major field) and place your mark along the line to rate your instructor in comparison with other college teachers you have had.

Check (✓) anywhere along the top of the line. Please read each item carefully.

Is your instructor clear and understandable in his explanations?

	5	4	3	2	1	
confusing						clear
<hr/>						

Does your instructor take an active personal interest in the progress of the class?

	1	2	3	4	5	
interested in the class						disinterested in the class
<hr/>						

Is your instructor friendly and sympathetic in manner?

	5	4	3	2	1	
unfriendly, unsympathetic						friendly, sympathetic
<hr/>						

Does your instructor show interest and enthusiasm in this course?

	5	4	3	2	1	
unenthusiastic						enthusiastic
<hr/>						

Does your instructor interest students in his subject matter?

	1	2	3	4	5	
interests students in subject matter						does not interest students in subject matter
<hr/>						

How would you evaluate the level of difficulty of your instructor's tests?

	1	2	3	4	5	
difficult						easy
<hr/>						

How well do your instructor's tests sample the material covered in the class and in the text book?

	1	2	3	4	5	
fairly						unfair coverage
<hr/>						

What do you believe your instructor has done especially well in his teaching of this course?

What specific things do you believe your instructor might do to improve the teaching in this course?

If you were grading your instructor as A B C D F, what grade would you give?

How valuable was the course to you?

valuable, worth the time invested	1	2	3	4	5	not valuable, a complete waste of time
	'	'	'	'	'	

Form #1

## CHABOT COLLEGE

EVALUATION SHEET

The purpose of this brief questionnaire is to help me improve the course. Your candid comments, criticisms, and suggestions are appreciated. Please do not sign your name. Thank you.

LECTURE: The lectures were mainly helpful\_\_\_\_, fair\_\_\_\_, mainly useless\_\_\_\_  
Comments:

HOMEWORK: The assignments were too long\_\_\_\_, about right\_\_\_\_, too short\_\_\_\_.  
They were too difficult\_\_\_\_, about right\_\_\_\_, too easy\_\_\_\_.  
Comments:

LABS: The labs were good\_\_\_\_, fair\_\_\_\_, waste of time\_\_\_\_.

Best experiment:\_\_\_\_\_

Poorest experiment:\_\_\_\_\_  
Comments:

TEXTBOOK: I found the text good\_\_\_\_, fair\_\_\_\_, poor\_\_\_\_.

I found the lab manual good\_\_\_\_, fair\_\_\_\_, poor\_\_\_\_.  
Comments:

EXAMS: The exams were a fair test of the subject matter: Yes\_\_\_\_, No\_\_\_\_.

I would prefer more\_\_\_\_, same number\_\_\_\_, fewer\_\_\_\_ tests.  
Comments:

COMPREHENSION: What helped you most? Mark in order of importance,

"1" for most, "5" for least.

Lecture \_\_\_\_\_  
Lab \_\_\_\_\_  
Text \_\_\_\_\_  
Homework \_\_\_\_\_  
Class discussion \_\_\_\_\_  
Comments:

# COLLEGE OF MARIN STUDENT RATING SHEET

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Section \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Do NOT indicate your name any place on this sheet. This form is being used to improve the quality of instruction at the college, so thoughtful judgment is requested. Make a check in the appropriate squares to the right of the quality. CODE: AA-Above Average; A-Average; BA-Below Average; N-No judgement possible.

## LIST OF QUALITIES

1. Knowledge of subject . . . . .
2. Use of current developments in subject area . . . . .
3. Interest in subject . . . . .
4. Explanation of difficult material . . . . .
5. Ability to make subject interesting . . . . .
6. Clarity of assignments . . . . .
7. Encouraging attitude toward student questions . . . . .
8. Ability to get classroom cooperation of students . . . . .
9. Ability to put students at ease . . . . .
10. Efficient use of class time . . . . .
11. Quality and use of voice . . . . .
12. General appearance . . . . .
13. Understanding of and sympathy for student problems . . . . .
14. Willingness to accept different points of view . . . . .
15. Impartiality in class, in grading . . . . .
16. Success in arousing out-of-class interest in subject . . . . .
17. Willingness to help students out of class . . . . .
18. Ability to relate subject with other subject areas . . . . .
19. Sense of humor . . . . .
20. Enthusiasm for teaching . . . . .

AA	A	BA	N

## CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Do you feel the class meetings were valuable to you? Yes No
2. Do you feel the tests fairly judged your knowledge of the subject? Yes No
3. Would you recommend this class to your friends? Yes No

Please make any additional comments below or on the reverse side of this page.

## COALINGA COLLEGE

FACULTY RATING FORMDateYear in School                     Sex                     Major                     

## TO THE STUDENT:

I have requested that this rating be made. The results will be given to me for information and use. They will not be shown to anyone else without my consent. The purpose of the project is the improvement of teaching methods through constructive student evaluation.

## RATING OF INSTRUCTOR:

Consider carefully each of the items listed below and rate each one as fairly and as objectively as you would want me to rate you. Try not to let your general dislike or liking of me or of the course affect your judgment on each individual item. Indicate by ENCIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER AFTER EACH ITEM.

- (a) Check the difficulty of this course, taking into account the purpose and curricular level, amount of time and effort required outside of classroom and laboratory, and the number of hours of credit given.

A - Very difficult; B - Moderately difficult; C - Average;  
D - Moderately easy; E - Very easy.

A - Excellent. B - Above Average. C - Average. D - Below Average. E - Poor.  
O - Insufficient Basis for Judgment.

Gives clear, reasonable assignments                    A      B      C      D      E      O

Explains and organizes subject matter adequately                    A      B      C      D      E      O

Evaluates and grades student achievement accurately and impartially:

(a) Plays no favorites                    A      B      C      D      E      O

(b) Provides opportunity through term papers, class discussions and tests for students to reveal what they know about course                    A      B      C      D      E      O

Type and quality of testing:

(a) Reasonable in length                    A      B      C      D      E      O

(b) Covers work and objectives of the course adequately                    A      B      C      D      E      O

## FACULTY RATING FORM

Page 1

Shows interest and effectiveness in giving needed individual help:

(a) Is willing to meet with students A B C D E O

(b) Sets aside and keeps office hours (or appointments) for individual conferences A B C D E O

Respects the opinion and questions of his students A B C D E O

Stimulates thinking and independent work A B C D E O

Displays enthusiasm and interest in his subject A B C D E O

Is generally effective in his teaching A B C D E O

Do you dislike coming to this class and are you glad when it is over?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If so, is it because of (check one):

\_\_\_\_\_ The Course  
\_\_\_\_\_ The Instructor  
\_\_\_\_\_ Both  
\_\_\_\_\_ Something Else

If you were considering whether or not to enroll for another course taught by the same instructor, would the fact that he was teaching it be (check one):

\_\_\_\_\_ An added reason for taking it  
\_\_\_\_\_ Immaterial  
\_\_\_\_\_ An added reason for not taking

How does the instructor's conduct strike you? (check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ Does he lecture to himself?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Does he maintain working rapport with his class?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Does he show off offensively?

THE FOLLOWING ARE OPTIONAL (use back of page if necessary)

List any mannerisms (include voice if applicable) of the instructor which detract from the effectiveness of his classroom presentation:

List any other suggestions which you can offer for improvement of the course.

List qualities which make the instructor outstanding.

COLLEGE OF MARIN  
STUDENT RATING SHEET

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Section \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Do NOT indicate your name any place on this sheet. This form is being used to improve the quality of instruction at the college, so thoughtful judgment is requested. Make a check in the appropriate square to the right of the quality. CODE: AA-Above Average; A-Average; BA-Below Average; N-No judgement possible.

LIST OF QUALITIES

1. Knowledge of subject . . . . .
2. Use of current developments in subject area . . . . .
3. Interest in subject . . . . .
4. Explanation of difficult material . . . . .
5. Ability to make subject interesting . . . . .
6. Clarity of assignments . . . . .
7. Encouraging attitude toward student questions . . . . .
8. Ability to get classroom cooperation of students . . . . .
9. Ability to put students at ease . . . . .
10. Efficient use of class time . . . . .
11. Quality and use of voice . . . . .
12. General appearance . . . . .
13. Understanding of and sympathy for student problems . . . . .
14. Willingness to accept different points of view . . . . .
15. Impartiality in class, in grading . . . . .
16. Success in arousing out-of-class interest in subject . . . . .
17. Willingness to help students out of class . . . . .
18. Ability to relate subject with other subject areas . . . . .
19. Sense of humor . . . . .
20. Enthusiasm for teaching . . . . .

AA	A	BA	N

CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Do you feel the class meetings were valuable to you?                      Yes    No
2. Do you feel the tests fairly judged your knowledge of the                      Yes    No  
  subject?
3. Would you recommend this class to your friends?                      Yes    No

Please make any additional comments below or on the reverse side of this page.

# MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

## Student Rating of Instructors

Your instructor is seeking your reaction to this course and his methods of teaching. Your honest judgment is all the questionnaire requires.

Following is a list of ten qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate this instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items.

Place an "x" before one item in each of the ten categories listed:

### 1. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

- ☐ Systematic and thorough
- ☐ Adequate (could be better)
- ☐ Inadequate (detracts from course)
- ☐ Confused and unsystematic

### 2. TEACHING METHODS

- ☐ Well planned and adapted to subject and students
- ☐ Some variety of method
- ☐ Same techniques used continuously
- ☐ No evidence of planned methods

### 3. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS

- ☐ Always eager to help
- ☐ Moderately helpful
- ☐ Avoids individual conferences
- ☐ Cold, unconcerned with students

### 4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT

- ☐ Exceptionally well informed
- ☐ Adequately informed
- ☐ Not well informed
- ☐ Very inadequately informed

### 5. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Sometimes unfair
- ☐ Mostly careless and unfair

### 6. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN

- ☐ Explanations clear and to point
- ☐ Explanations usually adequate
- ☐ Explanations often inadequate
- ☐ Explanations seldom given, or usually inadequate

### 7. ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING

- ☐ Continually makes you think for yourself
- ☐ Stimulates considerable thinking
- ☐ Not much thinking required
- ☐ Discourages original thinking

### 8. SPEAKING ABILITY

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good (does not detract from course)
- ☐ Fair (detracts from course)
- ☐ Poor (seriously handicaps learning)

### 9. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT

- ☐ Enthusiastic (enjoys teaching)
- ☐ Sometimes interested
- ☐ Bored (routine interest)
- ☐ Not interested (tired of subject)

### 10. GENERAL RATING

Compared to all instructors you have had, how do you rate this instructor?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

COMMENTS:

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTORS

Porterville College is rating itself in an effort to find out its quality of instruction. Your honest judgment is all this questionnaire requires. You are not to sign your name. Below is a list of 15 qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate the instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items. Circle the number that best describes this instructor most of the time in each classification: A, B, C, D, or F.

The 4 represents an "A" instructor.

" 3	"	"B"	"
" 2	"	"C"	"
" 1	"	"D"	"
" 0	"	"F"	"

Example: "A" indicates an excellent teacher, one among the top ten you've ever had.

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. GENERAL RATING COMPARED WITH ALL TEACHERS YOU'VE HAD . . . . .   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER . . . . .<br>Does this teacher organize his lectures, clearly word his questions and seem to work ideas out systematically to help make the difficult subjects more easily understood?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. SUBJECT MATTER IS KEPT UP-TO-DATE . . . . .  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT . . . . .<br>How well is this teacher informed in terms of your class' subject?   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 5. TEACHING METHODS . . . . .<br>Some ways to impart and to teach give better results than others. Does this teacher try different ways, e.g. to teach as to lecture, ask questions for class answers, have student reports, term papers, field trips?                                  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. CLASS MANAGEMENT AND DISCIPLINE . . . . .<br>Does this teacher seem to have students who talk when he is speaking, or disturb other members of the class? Do students show disrespect or disregard his directions?   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS . . . . .<br>Is this teacher helpful during the class, and outside of the class, by showing a personal or professional interest in you as one of his students?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 8. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS . . . . .<br>Do his quizzes and examinations cover the important points of the course? Does he take the opportunity to review any questions and/or answers that may be of concern to students -- after the examination papers are returned?                  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 9. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN . . . . .<br>Are his explanations usually clear, to the point, and adequate for gaining an understanding of the important concepts (ideas) he presents or assigns?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING . . . . .<br>Does this teacher stimulate you to think, inside and outside of class, and even sometimes cause you to perceive more clearly?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 11. SPEAKING ABILITY . . . . .<br>Do you believe that this teacher "speaks easily"? Does he usually seem to be at ease and comfortable when teaching before your class? Does he make you listen and pay attention to him by the way that he talks and the way that he conducts himself? | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 12. PERSONAL APPEARANCE . . . . .<br>Do his appearance and clothing give evidence of pride and neatness?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 13. ENTHUSIASTIC ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT . . . . .<br>Is this teacher interested or even enthusiastic about his subject? Do you sometimes feel that you could get interested, too, in some of his ideas?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 14. SENSE OF HUMOR . . . . .<br>Can he give and/or take a joke? Do you find yourself laughing later about something that he said? Is he serious most of the time, but can on occasion give an interesting "twist" to a point to make it seem funny and interesting?                     | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 15. LEVEL OF STANDARDS OF INSTRUCTION . . . . .<br>Do you think, and/or have you heard that he is a "tough" teacher? Is he teaching a college course or is he teaching as they teach in high school?  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Totals

Score

Add the total numbers circled; divide by 15; carry out to 2 decimal places.

Please use the back for further comments.

# A PUPIL'S RATING SCALE OF AN INSTRUCTOR

Instructor's name. (Please print) \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Each of the qualities listed below is divided into three sections. Each section is divided into four degrees and numbered accordingly from 1 to 9, 1 being the highest degree and 9 the lowest. In rating, draw a circle around the number which best describes your instructor.

Your fair and honest opinion is what really counts. Your instructor desires this rating for his own self-improvement.

<b>ORGANIZATION OF COURSE</b>	1 Carefully planned; well organized.	2 Somewhat planned; well organized.	3 Somewhat planned; well organized.	4 Some organization but not always clear.	5 Some organization but not always clear.	6 Some organization but not always clear.	7 Little organization and planning.	8 Little organization and planning.	9 Little organization and planning.
<b>TEACHING SKILL</b>	1 Produces rapid interest in subject; creates real desire; keeps things moving.	2 Produces rapid interest in subject; creates real desire; keeps things moving.	3 Produces rapid interest in subject; creates real desire; keeps things moving.	4 Teaching procedure without changes; student interest wanes.	5 Teaching procedure without changes; student interest wanes.	6 Teaching procedure without changes; student interest wanes.	7 Course tends to be dry and uninteresting; slow paced steps.	8 Course tends to be dry and uninteresting; slow paced steps.	9 Course tends to be dry and uninteresting; slow paced steps.
<b>PREPARATION FOR EACH CLASS</b>	1 Shows definite evidence of careful preparation.	2 Shows definite evidence of careful preparation.	3 Shows definite evidence of careful preparation.	4 Shows some preparation; materials not always clear in instructor's mind.	5 Shows some preparation; materials not always clear in instructor's mind.	6 Shows some preparation; materials not always clear in instructor's mind.	7 Not well prepared; lacks accurate knowledge.	8 Not well prepared; lacks accurate knowledge.	9 Not well prepared; lacks accurate knowledge.
<b>ENTHUSIASM AND INTEREST IN COURSE</b>	1 Genuinely interested and enthusiastic.	2 Genuinely interested and enthusiastic.	3 Genuinely interested and enthusiastic.	4 Appears to be rather positively interested.	5 Appears to be rather positively interested.	6 Appears to be rather positively interested.	7 Course seems to be uninteresting to the instructor.	8 Course seems to be uninteresting to the instructor.	9 Course seems to be uninteresting to the instructor.
<b>ASSIGNMENTS</b>	1 Students understand clearly the tasks of each new assignment.	2 Students understand clearly the tasks of each new assignment.	3 Students understand clearly the tasks of each new assignment.	4 At times incomplete; often stated somewhat hurriedly.	5 At times incomplete; often stated somewhat hurriedly.	6 At times incomplete; often stated somewhat hurriedly.	7 Unreasonable; hurriedly given; vague.	8 Unreasonable; hurriedly given; vague.	9 Unreasonable; hurriedly given; vague.
<b>JUDGMENT OF VALUES</b>	1 Selects important ideas; omits unimportant items.	2 Selects important ideas; omits unimportant items.	3 Selects important ideas; omits unimportant items.	4 Sometimes overlooks important points; spends time on insignificant details.	5 Sometimes overlooks important points; spends time on insignificant details.	6 Sometimes overlooks important points; spends time on insignificant details.	7 Frequently misses important ideas; wanders off on trivial details.	8 Frequently misses important ideas; wanders off on trivial details.	9 Frequently misses important ideas; wanders off on trivial details.
<b>CLASS DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS</b>	1 Questions challenging; demand sound thinking; discussions interesting and stimulating.	2 Questions challenging; demand sound thinking; discussions interesting and stimulating.	3 Questions challenging; demand sound thinking; discussions interesting and stimulating.	4 Questions rather easy and simple; often calls for memorized facts; discussions ramble.	5 Questions rather easy and simple; often calls for memorized facts; discussions ramble.	6 Questions rather easy and simple; often calls for memorized facts; discussions ramble.	7 Asks few questions; very little discussion.	8 Asks few questions; very little discussion.	9 Asks few questions; very little discussion.
<b>POISE AND SELF-CONFIDENCE</b>	1 Well poised; sure of himself; not easily upset.	2 Well poised; sure of himself; not easily upset.	3 Well poised; sure of himself; not easily upset.	4 Somewhat embarrassed at times; fairly self-confident.	5 Somewhat embarrassed at times; fairly self-confident.	6 Somewhat embarrassed at times; fairly self-confident.	7 Easily upset; uncertain as to procedure; lacks confidence.	8 Easily upset; uncertain as to procedure; lacks confidence.	9 Easily upset; uncertain as to procedure; lacks confidence.
<b>EXAMINATIONS</b>	1 Questions thought-provoking; carefully selected; clear.	2 Questions thought-provoking; carefully selected; clear.	3 Questions thought-provoking; carefully selected; clear.	4 Questions usually factual; require little thinking.	5 Questions usually factual; require little thinking.	6 Questions usually factual; require little thinking.	7 Examinations poorly planned and managed.	8 Examinations poorly planned and managed.	9 Examinations poorly planned and managed.
<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b>	1 Excellent mastery of subject; wide fund of knowledge in other fields.	2 Excellent mastery of subject; wide fund of knowledge in other fields.	3 Excellent mastery of subject; wide fund of knowledge in other fields.	4 Knowledge fair but without depth.	5 Knowledge fair but without depth.	6 Knowledge fair but without depth.	7 Knowledge frequently very inadequate.	8 Knowledge frequently very inadequate.	9 Knowledge frequently very inadequate.
<b>ABILITY TO CREATE STUDENT INTEREST</b>	1 Usually stimulates strong interest.	2 Usually stimulates strong interest.	3 Usually stimulates strong interest.	4 Arouses only mild student interest.	5 Arouses only mild student interest.	6 Arouses only mild student interest.	7 Classroom dull and students are indifferent.	8 Classroom dull and students are indifferent.	9 Classroom dull and students are indifferent.
<b>CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND DISCIPLINE</b>	1 Efficient management; pupils orderly and attentive.	2 Efficient management; pupils orderly and attentive.	3 Efficient management; pupils orderly and attentive.	4 Satisfactory organization; few disciplinary problems.	5 Satisfactory organization; few disciplinary problems.	6 Satisfactory organization; few disciplinary problems.	7 Poor organization; many disciplinary problems.	8 Poor organization; many disciplinary problems.	9 Poor organization; many disciplinary problems.
<b>SPEECH</b>	1 Voice pleasant; speaks distinctly and clearly.	2 Voice pleasant; speaks distinctly and clearly.	3 Voice pleasant; speaks distinctly and clearly.	4 Speaks fairly well.	5 Speaks fairly well.	6 Speaks fairly well.	7 Poor voice; words not clear; weak enunciation.	8 Poor voice; words not clear; weak enunciation.	9 Poor voice; words not clear; weak enunciation.
<b>TOLERANCE</b>	1 Encourages students to express opinions even though they differ with the instructor's ideas.	2 Encourages students to express opinions even though they differ with the instructor's ideas.	3 Encourages students to express opinions even though they differ with the instructor's ideas.	4 At times appears to be disturbed and impatient when students oppose instructor's views.	5 At times appears to be disturbed and impatient when students oppose instructor's views.	6 At times appears to be disturbed and impatient when students oppose instructor's views.	7 Resolute opposition; intolerant.	8 Resolute opposition; intolerant.	9 Resolute opposition; intolerant.
<b>SENSE OF HUMOR</b>	1 Possesses keen sense of humor.	2 Possesses keen sense of humor.	3 Possesses keen sense of humor.	4 Rather sober and serious; somewhat humorous at times.	5 Rather sober and serious; somewhat humorous at times.	6 Rather sober and serious; somewhat humorous at times.	7 Shows little or no humor.	8 Shows little or no humor.	9 Shows little or no humor.
<b>PERSONAL APPEARANCE</b>	1 Appearance neat; well dressed and in good taste.	2 Appearance neat; well dressed and in good taste.	3 Appearance neat; well dressed and in good taste.	4 Appearance fair; somewhat untidy at times.	5 Appearance fair; somewhat untidy at times.	6 Appearance fair; somewhat untidy at times.	7 Unclean; careless and untidy.	8 Unclean; careless and untidy.	9 Unclean; careless and untidy.
<b>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTOR</b>	1 Attitude of friendliness; feeling of mutual interest.	2 Attitude of friendliness; feeling of mutual interest.	3 Attitude of friendliness; feeling of mutual interest.	4 Attitude somewhat indifferent; neither ill-will nor friendliness prevails.	5 Attitude somewhat indifferent; neither ill-will nor friendliness prevails.	6 Attitude somewhat indifferent; neither ill-will nor friendliness prevails.	7 Considerable spirit of antagonism between students and instructor; antagonistic air.	8 Considerable spirit of antagonism between students and instructor; antagonistic air.	9 Considerable spirit of antagonism between students and instructor; antagonistic air.

On the back of this form, PRINT any annoying mannerisms your instructor has developed which should be corrected. Also PRINT your criticisms of the course. These will be very helpful to your instructor's self-improvement. Do not sign your name.

# ANSWER SHEET FOR A PUPIL'S RATING OF AN INSTRUCTOR

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Course						
Code No. of Course						
Instructor						
Code No. of Instructor						
Grade in Course						

## TRAITS

## YOUR RATINGS

Organization						
Skill						
Preparation						
Enthusiasm						
Assignments						
Values						
Discussion						
Poise						
Examinations						
Scholarships						
Interest						
Discipline						
Speech						
Tolerance						
Humor						
Appearance						
Friendliness						

Date of Rating \_\_\_\_\_

Sex of Rater M \_\_\_\_\_  
F \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Semesters At S.D.V.C. \_\_\_\_\_

# SANTA MONICA CITY COLLEGE

## Student Opinion Of Teaching

Name of Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_ Class Hour \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Major \_\_\_\_\_ Semester in College \_\_\_\_\_

It is of first importance that the college be continuously informed of the quality of its teaching and the respects in which the teaching can be improved. Your evaluation may help.

This survey is made by the instructor in this class. He alone will see the ratings and comments. PLEASE BE FRANK!

I. Rate your instructor on the following characteristics, making each answer a separate judgment:

	HIGH					LOW				
	1	2	3	4	5					
1. Interests students in his subject and stimulates thinking _____										

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

2. Takes an active personal interest in the progress of his class _____	1	2	3	4	5					
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

3. Is well versed in his subject and its applications _____	1	2	3	4	5					
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

4. Shows enthusiasm for his subject _____	1	2	3	4	5					
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

5. Gives reasonable and well-prepared tests _____	1	2	3	4	5					
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

II. Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he has done especially well in his teaching of this course:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

III. Your instructor would appreciate knowing if you feel that there was anything that he did in an unsatisfactory manner:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

IV. Your instructor would also like to know specific things you believe he might do to improve his teaching in this course:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE USE THE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.)

**CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION**  
**Student Rating of Instructors**  
 (Adapted from Riley, The Student Looks at His Teacher)

Each junior college is rating itself in an effort to find out the quality of teaching in all junior colleges. Your answers to this questionnaire will be confidential; your instructor will turn in a summary without his name; results will be accumulated by your college officers. Your honest judgment is all the questionnaire requires.

Here is a list of ten qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate this instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items.

Place an "X" on one of the lines under each of the ten categories:

**1. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER**

Systematic and thorough \_\_\_\_\_  
 Adequate (could be better) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Inadequate (detracts from course) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Confused and unsystematic \_\_\_\_\_

**2. TEACHING METHODS**

Well planned and adapted to subject \_\_\_\_\_  
 and students \_\_\_\_\_  
 Some variety of method \_\_\_\_\_  
 Same techniques used continuously \_\_\_\_\_  
 No evidence of planned methods \_\_\_\_\_

**3. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS**

Always eager to help \_\_\_\_\_  
 Moderately helpful \_\_\_\_\_  
 Avoids individual conferences \_\_\_\_\_  
 Cold, unconcerned with students \_\_\_\_\_

**4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT**

Exceptionally well informed \_\_\_\_\_  
 Adequately informed \_\_\_\_\_  
 Not well informed \_\_\_\_\_  
 Very inadequately informed \_\_\_\_\_

**5. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS**

Excellent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sometimes unfair \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mostly careless and unfair \_\_\_\_\_

**6. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN**

Explanations clear and to point \_\_\_\_\_  
 Explanations usually adequate \_\_\_\_\_  
 Explanations often inadequate \_\_\_\_\_  
 Explanations seldom given, or \_\_\_\_\_  
 usually inadequate \_\_\_\_\_

**7. ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING**

Continually makes you think for \_\_\_\_\_  
 yourself \_\_\_\_\_  
 Stimulates considerable thinking \_\_\_\_\_  
 Not much thinking required \_\_\_\_\_  
 Discourages original thinking \_\_\_\_\_

**8. SPEAKING ABILITY**

Excellent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Good (does not detract from \_\_\_\_\_  
 course) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fair (detracts from course) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Poor (seriously handicaps \_\_\_\_\_  
 learning) \_\_\_\_\_

**9. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT**

Enthusiastic (enjoys teaching) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sometimes interested \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bored (routine interest) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Not interested (tired of subject) \_\_\_\_\_

**10. GENERAL RATING**

Compared to all instructors you \_\_\_\_\_  
 have had, how do you rate this \_\_\_\_\_  
 instructor? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Excellent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Good \_\_\_\_\_  
 Fair \_\_\_\_\_  
 Poor \_\_\_\_\_

Total checks in: Column 1 \_\_\_\_\_ X 4 = \_\_\_\_\_  
 Column 2 \_\_\_\_\_ X 3 = \_\_\_\_\_  
 Column 3 \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 = \_\_\_\_\_  
 Column 4 \_\_\_\_\_ X 1 = \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE:**

# CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS

## TEACHER SELF-APPRAISAL\*

1. Regardless of how long we have been teaching, we never attain perfection. There is always a place for an intelligent self-analysis of our methods and our techniques.
2. Most people do not like to be criticized even though the criticism is constructive, just and friendly. Instead of waiting for someone to pass judgment on your work, why not make a critical self-appraisal? In this way you can discover your weak points and take steps to correct them.
3. In making a self-appraisal, you should consider in particular, lesson planning, conduct of the class session and testing. Remember that you are turning the searchlight upon yourself in order to see how your performance looks to the other person. The benefit you will derive from this procedure will be governed by your willingness to recognize your faults and your determination to correct them. The above suggestions are offered, not as a final answer to teaching problems, but as a basis for a re-check on the methods you are using.

### LESSON PLANNING

1. Do you plan your lesson or do you go to class with only a general idea of what you are going to do?
2. Is the objective well defined and can it be accomplished by the presentation that you plan to make?
3. Do you study each particular topic to find the most effective way to present it?
4. Does your lesson plan include all of the important points and exclude the irrelevant?
5. Is your lesson plan logical in order and does it make a clear connection with what has gone before?
6. Does your lesson plan have application to some specific thing that the students are to do?
7. Do you make an intelligent and effective use of instructional aids?

\*Acknowledgment - B. L. Fitzgerald, Assistant Director  
Los Angeles Trade Technical Junior College

## CONDUCT OF CLASS SESSION

1. Do you know what you are trying to do in class?
2. Do you tell the students the importance of the topic that is to be discussed and why?
3. Do you spend most of the time just talking? If you do, the chances are that the students do not learn much.
4. Do you have the class session organized so there is no waste of time?
5. Are you lowering your class standards by allowing students to take too much time for their intermission?
6. Are you prepared for questions asked or do you evade them?
7. Are you courteous and considerate in answering questions?
8. Do you hide the chalkboard with your body? Do you face the class or talk to the chalkboard?
9. Do you start and end your class session on time?
10. Do the students go to sleep in class? If they do, it is time for you to wake up.

## TESTING

1. Do you go to the trouble to construct good tests?
2. Are your tests representative of the material given in class, clear as to meaning and of reasonable length?
3. Do you let your class go without tests because you do not like to grade the papers?
4. In grading tests, do you give each question a value in proportion to its importance?
5. Do you try to be fair and impartial in grading?
6. Do you have sufficient information on each student to establish fair term grades?
7. Do you hide poor teaching with high grades?
8. Do you realize that every time you give the students a test, you are testing yourself too?

MERCED COLLEGE  
OBSERVATION APPOINTMENT SHEET

FACULTY MEMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

For my first visit to your class it seems appropriate that you know when I'm coming. Would it be convenient for me to visit your class during the following period and date? \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate below:

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If no, please mention the reason:

Thank you very much. Please return to \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator

MC-I-9-7/1/64

# MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE. . . ANNUAL REPORT ON CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL\*

INSTRUCTOR \_\_\_\_\_ Preliminary \_\_\_\_\_  
 DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_ Final Report \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ School Year \_\_\_\_\_  
 CREDENTIAL HELD: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Subject or Assignment \_\_\_\_\_  
 EXPIRATION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN MONTEREY  
 First Year Second Year Third Year Total Years \_\_\_\_\_

Length of time teacher has been under your supervision: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Years Months

All categories below must include a brief description in concrete and specific terms of the criteria that were considered in the evaluation.

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE IN THE CLASSROOM:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

COMMENTS:

RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND ADULTS:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

COMMENTS:

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

COMMENTS:

PERSONAL QUALITIES:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

COMMENTS:

\* In the case of permanent staff members, this report will be \_\_\_\_\_ eted every three years.

**SUMMARY STATEMENT:** (This space must not be left blank.)

---

**RECOMMENDATION FOR RE-ELECTION--To be completed at the second Evaluation Conference held before the last Friday before Spring recess.**

In all cases of recommendation for re-election, the final decision rests upon action of the Board of Trustees. The board requires a report of outstanding or very good in all major areas to justify recommendation for permanent tenure.

**FOR SECOND YEAR TEACHERS ONLY:**

The teacher's possibility of achieving tenure has been discussed with him and is summarized above.

**Yes**

**No**

**RECOMMENDED FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT or RECOMMENDED FOR PERMANENT TENURE IF A THIRD YEAR PROBATIONARY TEACHER**

**Yes**

**No**

---

**Date**

---

**Signature of Superintendent**

---

**TEACHER'S STATEMENT:**

I have read this report and recognize that I have the privilege of discussing it with the Superintendent of the District if I so desire. I realize that I may see this report at any subsequent time.

---

**Date**

---

**Signature of Teacher**

**Copies to:** Superintendent  
Vice President  
Teacher on request

**MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE  
TEACHER EVALUATION WORK SHEET**

TEACHER \_\_\_\_\_ DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECTS TAUGHT \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ YEAR OF SERVICE \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

(Graded Outstanding, Satisfactory, Conditional, Unsatisfactory  
RANKS)

1. Knows subject matter.	O	S	C	U
2. Communicates subject matter to students using teaching techniques and procedures effectively (voice, visual, organization, etc.)	O	S	C	U
3. Works constructively with administration and colleagues in professional duties.	O	S	C	U
4. Assists students willingly outside of assigned classroom hours.	O	S	C	U
5. Is competent in functional details (classroom management, reports, attendance, etc.)	O	S	C	U
6. Understands student behavior and learning problems (motivation, etc.)	O	S	C	U
7. Instructs at the educational level of the course he teaches.	O	S	C	U
8. Has respect of and for colleagues and students.	O	S	C	U
9. Shows enthusiasm for teaching and for the general college program including extra-curricular activities.	O	S	C	U
10. Is emotionally stable, professionally mature, and perceptive of his educational role.	O	S	C	U
11. Is professional regarding personal conduct, grooming, and college obligations.	O	S	C	U
12. Is energetic and free from detrimental physical impairments.	O	S	C	U

A check of outstanding, conditional, or unsatisfactory in any category must be accompanied by an explanatory remark from the evaluator.

EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_

## ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING SHEET  
January 15th Report\_\_\_\_\_  
Date\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Instructor

1. How well has this instructor completed his (her) assignment this year?

Outstanding	Superior	Competent	Needs Improvement	Borderline
-------------	----------	-----------	-------------------	------------

2. This instructor's ability and willingness to work with his colleagues and the total school community has been:

Outstanding	Superior	Competent	Needs Improvement	Borderline
-------------	----------	-----------	-------------------	------------

3. Professional growth of this instructor has been:

Outstanding	Superior	Competent	Needs Improvement	Borderline
-------------	----------	-----------	-------------------	------------

4. This instructor's relationships with students in his (her) assigned courses are:

Outstanding	Superior	Competent	Needs Improvement	Borderline
-------------	----------	-----------	-------------------	------------

Please answer either item 5 or 6:

5. If this instructor is a 1st or 2nd year instructor at Orange Coast College do you recommend he (she) be retained on our staff for the next school year?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, with reservations \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If no or yes, with reservations - cite specific reasons \_\_\_\_\_

6. If this instructor is eligible to become permanent, do you recommend he (she) be granted tenure? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If "no," cite specific reasons \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Observer

I have received a copy of this report: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Instructor

Rating: Outstanding: Unusually able in this area. Superior: Very well qualified in this area. Competent: This level of performance is expected. Needs Improvement: Self-explanatory. Borderline: Competence is doubtful.

Class Name: \_\_\_\_\_ In Room \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of Visit \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Students in Class: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Day and Hour \_\_\_\_\_ Men \_\_\_\_\_ Women \_\_\_\_\_

This form is to assist in the evaluation of current teaching and teaching potential by classroom observation. When other means than classroom visitation are used in making an evaluation of the instructor's efforts, an explanation will be made.

## Definitions:

- Excellent** - Extremely good of its kind; first-class; prime; select. Implies superiority in quality and action; surpasses or goes beyond good qualities.
- Good** - Sufficient or satisfactory for its purpose. Ample; considerable; honest; sincere; that which is serviceable, fit, beneficial, pleasant, and adequate.
- Fair** - Free from marked merit or defeat; average, mediocre; a fair chance of success. Room for improvement.
- Poor** - Not good, as in quality or workmanship; inferior. Unfavorable, inefficient, not satisfactory, inadequate. Needs definite improvement.
- N. A.** - Not applicable.

## Part I. Evaluation check-list of the classroom; the instructor; and instruction.

		Poor	Fair	Good	Exc.	N.A.
<b>A.</b>	<b><u>Physical Conditions</u></b>					
	1. lighting _____					
	2. heating, cooling, ventilation _____					
	3. equipment _____					
	4. bulletin board _____					
	5. distractions, absence of _____					
	6. adequacy of student space _____					
	7. other: _____					
<b>B.</b>	<b><u>Instructor's</u></b>					
	1. dress _____					
	2. voice _____					
	a. volume _____					
	b. modulation _____					
	c. change of pace _____					
	d. pleasantness _____					
	e. ease of delivery _____					
	f. speed _____					
	g. emphasis _____					
	h. clarity _____					

3. posture					
4. obvious health					
5. emotional stability					
6. judgment					
7. tact					
8. adaptability					
9. enthusiasm					
10. movement					
11. other					

C. Instruction

1. overall effectiveness					
2. variety					
a. lecture					
b. demonstration					
c. discussion					
d. audio-visual aids					
e. question & answer period					
f. drill					
g. tests and quizzes					
h. discipline					
i. review					
j. other					

Part II. This is an observer's evaluation in answer to teaching methods and routine, as observed during the class period.

1. The subject matter was:  
       \_\_\_\_\_ very interesting  
       \_\_\_\_\_ interesting  
       \_\_\_\_\_ boresome  
       \_\_\_\_\_ unusual  
       \_\_\_\_\_ very difficult  
       \_\_\_\_\_ relatively difficult  
       \_\_\_\_\_ easy

Comments: -

3. Was an assignment made for the class session?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If so, the assignment made was:

- \_\_\_\_\_ too long  
       \_\_\_\_\_ about right  
       \_\_\_\_\_ too short  
       \_\_\_\_\_ vague and hazy  
       \_\_\_\_\_ clearly presented & understood

Comments: -

2. Are any of these methods used in instruction:

- \_\_\_\_\_ outside reading  
       \_\_\_\_\_ reports  
       \_\_\_\_\_ field trips  
       \_\_\_\_\_ guest speakers  
       \_\_\_\_\_ other

Comments: -

4. How much interest did students show?

- \_\_\_\_\_ none  
       \_\_\_\_\_ little  
       \_\_\_\_\_ moderate  
       \_\_\_\_\_ considerable

Comments: -

5. How effectively was class time used?  
(lecture)

- ☐ started late, time dragged
- ☐ finished early
- ☐ most of class time used
- ☐ started promptly, used all of class time

Comments: -

9. How varied were the teaching methods?

- ☐ uses a single technique
- ☐ uses several techniques
- ☐ uses a wide variation of techniques

Comments: -

6. How effectively was class time used?  
(laboratory)

- ☐ started late, time dragged
- ☐ finished early
- ☐ most of class time used
- ☐ started promptly, used all of class time
- ☐ instructor available for individual student assistance

Comments: -

10. How evident and how good is the rapport between teacher and students?

- ☐ no evidence of student-teacher harmonious relationships
- ☐ average relationships
- ☐ students show great confidence in instructor
- ☐ repeated evidence of friendly relationships

Comments: -

7. Was the teacher well prepared?

- ☐ no written or definite plans
- ☐ some notes and plans
- ☐ evidence of thorough planning
- ☐ course outline was being followed
- ☐ other

Comments: -

11. What methods were used?

- ☐ summaries of previous lesson
- ☐ summaries of main points in assignment
- ☐ a test or quiz
- ☐ student summary given
- ☐ no summary or review of work covered

Comments: -

8. To what extent did students become involved in classwork?

- ☐ some participated
- ☐ most participated
- ☐ all participated
- ☐ the assignment did not lend itself for student participation

Comments: -

\*\*\*\*\*

## COMMENTS:

\*\*\*\*\*

To the instructor: I hereby certify that I have had the above evaluation explained to me and that I have received this copy of the evaluation. (Please return this form to the evaluator.) If the instructor wants to receive a copy of this evaluation, circle, Yes.

Signature of Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Date of signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

# SWEETWATER JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

## Certificated Personnel Evaluation Report

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Last \_\_\_\_\_ First \_\_\_\_\_ Middle \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time ☐  
Part-time ☐

Years in District ( including this year ) \_\_\_\_\_

Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

	College	Major	Year
Degrees: BA <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
MA <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
PhD <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____

Credential(s) held \_\_\_\_\_

### I. UNDER LINE STRONG POINTS AND CIRCLE WEAK POINTS

Teaching Technique	Appearance	Use of Supplies and Equipment	Relationship:
Subject Knowledge and Preparation	Voice	Loyalty and Cooperation	Student - Instructor
Discriminate in Criticisms	Health	Acceptance of Suggestions	Instructor - Instructor
Enthusiasm	Organization	Co-curricular Activities	Instructor - Administration
Sense of Humor	Accuracy and Promptness of Records		Community

### II. OVERALL EVALUATION: ( check one )

- ☐ SATISFACTORY
- ☐ IMPROVEMENT NEEDED - Needs experience or weaknesses corrected
- ☐ UNSATISFACTORY - Fails to meet requirements

### III. COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

The employee must sign this evaluation report, indicating awareness of the report, if the overall evaluation indicates IMPROVEMENT NEEDED or UNSATISFACTORY.

Employee's comments, if desired: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Employee's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

### IV. RECOMMENDATION: ( March 15 only) Re-employ ☐ Dismiss ☐

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation reports, when due, are to be forwarded directly to the Personnel Department.

November 1 (first year only)  
December 21 (all probationary)  
March 15 (all certificated)

COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Status \_\_\_\_\_ Subject \_\_\_\_\_

School Year \_\_\_\_\_

Reemployment Recommended \_\_\_\_\_

Reemployment Not Recommended \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Committee Signatures:	Date	Instructor's Signature	Date
----------------------------------	------	------------------------	------

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	(Instructor's signature does not mean agreement with report; it means the teacher has seen the report and has had an opportunity to discuss it.)	_____
_____	_____		_____
_____	_____		_____
_____	_____		_____

In the five areas below the Committee should indicate principal strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, along with recommendations for improvement and what has happened because of the recommendations. These should be documented with specific anecdotal reports of instances which illustrate the weakness or strength.

**I. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS AND EFFECTIVENESS:**

**XI. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:****III. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:**

**IV. PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH OTHERS: STUDENTS, FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION**

**V. COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:**

In the section below indicate what you consider this instructor's potential for growth is in his service at College of Marin.

Indicate this instructor's growth during his service at College of Marin.

## PERFORMANCE REPORT ON PROMOTIONAL CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Employee No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Last First Middle  
 School or Section \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_ Status \_\_\_\_\_  
 For period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

1. Conferences with this employee were held on (dates) \_\_\_\_\_
2. I conferred with this employee regarding this report on (date) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Specific needs discussed and recommendation made for improving services: (Use other side if necessary)

4. I consider the services of this employee to be:

WEAK	SATISFACTORY	STRONG	OUTSTANDING

(If rating is unsatisfactory, use Form 1015)

I have received a copy of this report.

I understand that any written statement I forward to the Personnel Division regarding this performance report will be attached to the copy which is filed there.

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Employee

Date

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Head of School or Section Date

**Instructions to Principals and Section Heads:** Prepare original and 3 copies of this form and forward original and one copy to your Assignment Administrator, Assistant Superintendent, or Branch Head within one week after end of period. The second copy is for your school files and the third copy should be given to the employee.

In case the employee is unavailable or unwilling to sign, that fact should be indicated in the signature space on all copies and the employee's copy should be forwarded along with original and first copy. The Personnel Division will deliver the form to the employee.

**Instructions to Branch Heads:** Forward the original of this form (and the employee's copy, if unsigned) to the Personnel Division, Department A. Keep one copy for your files.

I recommend that this employee: ( ) be retained in this position.  
 ( ) be discontinued from this position at the close of this school year.

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Assistant Superintendent or Branch Head

Date

NOTICE OF UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE OF CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

41

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Employee No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Last) (First) (Middle)  
 School Section \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_  
 Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Status \_\_\_\_\_

For period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

visited the above employee and observed his work on the following dates: \_\_\_\_\_

conferred with this employee regarding this notice on (date) \_\_\_\_\_

I consider the services of this employee to be unsatisfactory for the period indicated for the following reasons: (Continue on other side if necessary.)

I took the following steps to help this teacher improve: (Continue on other side if necessary.)

I recommend that this employee:  
 ( ) be continued in service in this school or section.  
 ( ) be continued in service in another school or section.  
 ( ) be discontinued from service.

I have received a copy of this report.  
 I understand that any written statement I forward to the Personnel Division regarding this performance report will be attached to the copy which is filed there.

Signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Department Chairman, Vice-Principal or Dean (Optional) Date

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Employee Date

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Head of School or Section Date

INSTRUCTIONS TO HEADS OF SCHOOLS OR SECTIONS: Prepare original and 3 copies of this form, have employee sign all copies, and forward original and first copy to your Assignment Administrator, Assistant Superintendent, or Branch Head within one week after end of period. The second copy is for your school files, and the third copy should be given to the employee. In case the employee is unavailable or unwilling to sign, that fact should be indicated in the signature space on all copies and the employee's copy should be forwarded along with the original and first copy. The Personnel Division will deliver the form to the employee.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BRANCH HEADS: Forward the original of this form (and the employee's copy if not signed by employee) to the Personnel Division, Department A. Keep one copy for your files.

I recommend that this employee:  
 ( ) be retained in service in this division  
 ( ) be discontinued from service

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Head of District, Branch, or Division Date

SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET

COALINGA COLLEGE

CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL EVALUATION

(School Year)

INSTRUCTOR \_\_\_\_\_

Fall 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
Spring 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ PROBATIONARY \_\_\_\_\_ PERMANENT

SUBJECTS \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ First \_\_\_\_\_ Second \_\_\_\_\_ Third

\_\_\_\_ Full Time \_\_\_\_\_ Part time

Date of Visitation \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_ Length \_\_\_\_\_

STRENGTHS AND, IF APPROPRIATE, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT WILL BE INDICATED  
IN EACH CATEGORY. SEE THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS SHEET FOR SPECIFIC AND GENERAL  
ITEMS APPLYING TO 1, 2, 3 BELOW.

1. Preparation for Instruction:

2. Instructional Effectiveness:

3. Professional Attitudes:

Administrator's Summary Statement:

\*Recommendation:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Dean of Instruction

-----  
Instructor's Comment:

I have read this report and recognize that I have the privilege of discussing  
it with the President if I so desire.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Instructor

\*In all cases the final action for re-employment rests with the Board of Trustees.

1. **Preparation for Instruction:** Planning for the course; continuity of instruction; activities related to objectives; development of course outline and guides.
2. **Instructional Effectiveness:** Illustration appropriate to course and lesson; speaks interestingly and understandably; focused discussions involving whole class; creates a favorable learning atmosphere; creates an interest in the subject; expects a high standard of performance; provides for individual differences; maintains a dignity appropriate to the profession; is tactful and considerate; is well groomed; has good health and energy; has emotional stability and control; has integrity and is sincere; grades students fairly and can rate them at reasonable times as the course progresses; assignments clear.
3. **Professional Attitudes:** Cooperation with colleagues; cooperation with administration; service on committees; cooperation and effectiveness in student activities; promptness of reports and accuracy of records; sense of responsibility toward school, school district; and community; attitude toward professional organizations.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Adopted April 16, 1963

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_

CLASSES TAUGHT	NO. SECTIONS	SIZE OF CLASSES
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Non-Teaching Assignments \_\_\_\_\_

CLASSES OBSERVED	DATE OF OBSERVATION	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	LENGTH OF OBSERVATIONS
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

UNSATISFACTORY      SATISFACTORY

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS		COMMENTS
<b>I. PERSONAL QUALITIES</b>		
1. <u>Personal appearance</u>		
2. <u>Health</u>		
3. <u>Self-confidence</u>		
4. <u>Punctuality</u>		
5. <u>Tact</u>		
6. <u>Voice Control</u>		
7. <u>Emotional control</u>		
8. <u>Cooperation</u>		
9. <u>Sense of humor</u>		
10. <u>Standards of personal behavior</u>		
11. <u>Judgment</u>		
<b>II. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE</b>		
1. <u>Daily preparation</u>		
2. <u>Attention to individual needs</u>		
3. <u>Attention to course content</u> <u>and scope</u>		
4. <u>Motivation</u>		
5. <u>Resourcefulness &amp; originality</u>		
6. <u>Knowledge of subject matter</u>		
<b>III. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT</b>		
1. <u>Control of environment</u>		
2. <u>Promptness and accuracy of</u> <u>reports</u>		
3. <u>Class management</u>		
<b>IV. TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIP</b>		
1. <u>Attitude toward pupils</u>		
2. <u>Understanding of pupils</u>		
3. <u>Tact and consideration</u>		
4. <u>Influence on attitude of pupils</u> <u>towards others</u>		
<b>V. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE AND GROWTH</b>		
1. <u>Observance of professional ethics</u>		
2. <u>Participation in professional</u> <u>activities*</u>		
3. <u>Interest in student activities</u>		
4. <u>Effective parent relationship</u>		
5. <u>Community participation*</u>		
6. <u>Inservice improvement</u>		
*Membership in a particular organization will not be a required criteria for a satisfactory rating.		
<b>VI. EVALUATION OF EXTRA ASSIGNMENTS</b>		
<b>VII. GENERAL RATING</b>		

COMMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Administrator \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher Comments on Above Report:

In What Way Can We Help You Improve Your Teaching?

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's signature indicates that report has been discussed but does not necessarily signify that the teacher agrees with the results. (If there is no appeal to the Superintendent within five days, acceptance of rating is indicated.)

SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT  
TEACHERS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES  
San Diego City Schools**

Name (last, first, middle)	Prob. Year: 1____2____3____	Date	For Personnel Division Use
	Permanent____Hourly____		

College	Department	Subject Field
---------	------------	---------------

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE	UNSATIS- FACTORY	REQUIRES IMPROVE- MENT	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE	OUT- STANDING
1. Knowledge of subject.....					
2. Consistent and careful planning in accordance with course of study.....					
3. Development and use of instructional techniques in meeting individual differences.....					
4. Motivation and direction of students' learning activities.....					
5. Rapport with students.....					
6. Evaluation of students' work .....					
7. Interest in and enthusiasm about teaching.....					
8. Other .....					

COMMENTS:

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	REQUIRES IMPROVE- MENT	SATIS- FACTORY
1. Grooming and general appearance.....		
2. Apparent physical health and energy.....		
3. Apparent emotional and social adjustment.....		
4. Use of good judgment.....		
5. Voice and speech.....		
6. Other.....		

COMMENTS:



**PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES AND GROWTH**

1. Observance of ethics of the teaching profession.....
2. Response to supervision and suggestions for improvement.....
3. Relationships with other school personnel.....
4. Willingness to share in college-wide responsibilities.....
5. Promptness and accuracy with reports.....
6. Response to authorized policies and procedures.....
7. Other.....

REQUIRES IMPROVE- MENT	SATIS- FACTORY	VERY EFFECTIVE

**COMMENTS:**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Evaluator

Teacher

**OVER-ALL PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL**

General evaluation of the teacher's performance in his present position:

UNSATISFACTORY	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE	OUTSTANDING
----------------	-------------------------	-----------	----------------	-------------

I feel that the possibility of meeting standards for permanency is:

POOR	QUESTION- ABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	NOT APPLICABLE
------	-------------------	------	------	-----------	-------------------

Teacher's Signature\*

Evaluator's Signature

Title

Date of conference with teacher

Reviewed by (signature)

Title

\*This signature indicates that the teacher and evaluator together discussed this report. It does not necessarily denote agreement with all factors of the evaluation.

San Jose Junior College District  
INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION REPORT

Name \_\_\_\_\_

1 2 3 Other

Observations (by whom, dates) \_\_\_\_\_

Conferences (by whom, dates) \_\_\_\_\_

Rate each item by a check mark on the line. (See reverse) Show by comment if unable to rate.  
Comments required for 1 or 2 rating.

Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Strong to Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A. ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHING

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

C. STUDENT ACCEPTANCE

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

D. FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

E. DISTRICT RELATIONSHIPS

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

F. PERSONAL QUALITIES

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

G. PROFESSIONAL STRENGTHS

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY EVALUATION

Recommendation:

☐  
☐  
☐

This employee should be retained

Permanent employment depends on further improvement

Continued employment not recommended

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/Instructor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

My signature indicates that the basis of this report has been discussed with me and that I have received a copy of it.

Formal evaluation procedures are designed to review and emphasize the instructor's responsibility to provide teaching service of the highest quality. They shall recognize excellence, and shall likewise identify ways in which the instructor can improve the quality of his teaching.

Probationary instructors shall be evaluated semi-annually, but any instructor may be formally evaluated whenever the procedures may lead to increased teaching effectiveness.

All available sources shall be used to make the report clear, complete, and accurate.

In items A-G below the descriptive words or phrases are suggested as guides to assist in identifying factors that relate to effective teaching.

Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Strong to Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### A. ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHING

- 1-2: Inadequate planning, disorganized, goals not clear, lacks initiative, poorly prepared materials
- 3-4-5: Adequate and appropriate planning, usually recognizable goals, reasonable initiative, acceptably prepared materials
- 6-7: Creative planning, clear and complete materials, always punctual, clearly defined goals, fair and effective tests

#### B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

- 1-2: Confusing, uninspiring, not at junior college level, student achievement below expectancy, poor voice quality and speech, lacks teaching skills
- 3-4-5: Logical, reasonable enthusiasm, objective, satisfactory student achievement, good voice and diction, satisfactory teaching skills
- 6-7: Resourceful, superior voice and vocabulary, highly motivating, consistently outstanding student achievement, excellent teaching skills

#### C. STUDENT ACCEPTANCE

- 1-2: Not respected, poor rapport, questionable fairness, gives little office help, undignified
- 3-4-5: Respected, considered fair, has good rapport, productive office hours
- 6-7: In high respect, regarded as truly professional teacher, office assistance highly appreciated, excellent rapport

#### D. FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

- 1-2: Anti-social, uncooperative, questionable ethics, not accepted by colleagues
- 3-4-5: Accepted by colleagues, cooperative, discreet, participates with faculty and department, accepts assigned responsibilities
- 6-7: Sought by colleagues, recognized leader, initiates and carries out, highly ethical

#### E. DISTRICT RELATIONSHIPS

- 1-2: Defensive, late and inaccurate with reports, antagonistic or insensitive to criticism, violates regulations, late to class or dismisses early
- 3-4-5: Handles routines and reports well, accepts criticism constructively, observes regulations, cooperative, represents District satisfactorily in community
- 6-7: Welcomes criticism and uses it with discrimination, handles routines efficiently, community leader, gives freely of time and resources

#### F. PERSONAL QUALITIES

- 1-2: Unkempt appearance, prejudiced, lacks maturity, excessive absences, rude or tasteless, lacks integrity
- 3-4-5: Courteous, careful, usually well-controlled, mature, adequate health and physical stamina, satisfactory impression
- 6-7: Impressive poise, excellent self-control, neatly groomed, obvious health and vigor, integrity

#### G. PROFESSIONAL STRENGTHS

- 1-2: Shows little interest in the profession, inadequate subject field knowledge, professional disloyalty, questionable ethical standards, inexpert in assignment
- 3-4-5: Up-to-date and well-informed in field, identifies self with the profession, ethical
- 6-7: Broad knowledge reflecting continuous growth in field, assumes and demonstrates ethical leadership, pride in profession, resourceful and versatile

EVALUATION REPORT  
ON  
PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTORS

# EVALUATION OF LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECH PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTORS

For Period Ending \_\_\_\_\_

42

Please return to Dean Johnson's Office on or before \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_

Conference with this employee held on: (Date) \_\_\_\_\_

## A. PERSONAL QUALITIES: (Check one in each area)

	Unsatisfactory	Weak	Average	Strong	Outstanding
Teacher attendance record _____					
Tact and Courtesy _____					
Quality of judgment _____					
Personal appearance _____					
Good speaking voice _____					
Sense of humor _____					
Poise in classroom _____					
Overall evaluation of A (Check one) _____					

## B. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES: (Check one in each area)

Acceptance of assignment responsibilities _____					
Cooperation with Administrators & Instructors _____					
Professional ethics _____					
Overall evaluation of B (Check one) _____					

## C. COMPETENCE: (Check one in each area)

_____					
Promptness in starting and closing classes _____					
Attention to daily attendance _____					
Accuracy of grading _____					
Classroom routine efficiency _____					
Lesson planning performance _____					
Preparation of instructional materials _____					
Student control and classroom morale _____					
Student achievement _____					
Knowledge and use of basic skills _____					
Knowledge of current practices _____					
Overall evaluation of C (Check one) _____					

Remarks:

Department Head's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor's Payroll Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

I have read this report but my signature does not necessarily indicate my agreement

REEDLEY COLLEGE  
Reedley, California

EVALUATION REPORT ON PROBATIONARY CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

NAME OF TEACHER \_\_\_\_\_  
CLASS \_\_\_\_\_  
PERIOD \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE OF VISITATION \_\_\_\_\_  
VISITATION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Prepare in quadruplicate  
copies to teacher, division  
chairman, dean of instruction,  
superintendent.

I. CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES:

\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

II. PERSONALITY:

\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

III. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

IV. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH:

\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\* \* \* \* \*

Date of conference held with teacher: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of observer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

The signature of the person observed does not necessarily indicate agreement, but only  
that the teacher has seen the rating and received a copy of the evaluation report.

TEACHER'S COMMENTS:

## Explanation of Page 1

The Evaluation Report is to be used for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of in-service training.
2. Evaluation for re-employment.
3. Evaluation of the teacher's relations with regard to the students, the community, and the profession.
4. Basis for the conference following the evaluation.

When checking any item under the headings of: (1) needs improvement; (2) unsatisfactory; or (3) any item when not checked, the evaluator shall present a statement written under Comments, explaining the area or item that is unsatisfactory, or needs improvement, or why the item is not checked.

### Suggested Criteria for Evaluation

#### Items on Page 1

##### I. CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES:

Student Relationships: Creates a favorable learning atmosphere. Creates an interest in the subject. Expects a high standard of performance. Provides for individual differences.

Presentation of Material: Applies subject matter to present day needs. Uses reference and supplementary material. Is well prepared for class work. Speaks interestingly and understandably.

Classroom Management: Provides for physical well being of students. Develops proper social control.

Personal Attributes: Is tactful and considerate. Is well groomed. Has good health and energy. Has emotional stability and control. Has integrity and is sincere.

Other: Grading procedures. Should be able to rate the student at all times.

##### II. PERSONALITY:

Humor, stable temperament, tactful, friendly, broad interests, appearance.

##### III. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

Cooperation with colleagues, cooperation with administration, service on committees, cooperation and effectiveness in student activities, promptness of reports and accuracy of records, sense of responsibility toward school, school district and community, attitude toward professional organizations.

##### IV. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH:

Uses professional publications, attends professional meetings (workshops) travels, seeks employment in subject area, seeks assistance from others, is familiar with community problems in subject areas, utilizes community resources, works on school and community committees, can identify his goals, has hobbies in subject areas, has done research.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE

Evaluation and Recommendation of Probationary Instructor

Name of Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Semesters completed  
at S.B.V.C. \_\_\_\_\_

Comments (cite specific  
evidence where possible)

Rating	Comments (cite specific evidence where possible)
1. Intellectual vigor	
Definitely Superior	Coll. Tchr. Average
	Below Coll. Average
2. Interest in teaching	
Enthusiastic	Average "It's a good job"
3. Preparation for teaching his subject	
Strong	Average Below Average
4. Personal standards in scholarship and professional activity	
High self standards	Satisfactory Will accept mediocrity
5. Standards of performance he sets for students	
Presses for excellence	Accepts Coll. Norm Condone mediocrity
6. Quality of writing and lecturing	
Excellent	Average Barely Acceptable
7. Skill in classroom & teaching laboratory	
Superior	Average Barely Acceptable
8. Interest in students	
Frequent & close contacts	Some Real interest Little Concern
9. Acceptance by students	
Sought by students	Average Some complaints mostly apathy or avoidance
10. Acceptance by colleagues	
Without reservation	Satisfactory Not Accepted

Recommendation:

Division Chairman

Date

Santa Barbara Junior College District  
EVALUATION FORM FOR PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTOR

Name of Probationary Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Class Visited \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete each category in this form in the following way (1) Evaluate the instructor's performance by placing (X) at the appropriate place along the scale. (2) Write a description of the instructor's performance, (3) Give example(s) that support the description. In addition to each category, please give an overall rating on the scale at the bottom of the page. One copy of form is for the instructor, one copy for the division chairman, one copy for the Instruction Office.

**PERSONALITY**

High | 1 2 3 4 5 Low

Description \_\_\_\_\_

Examples \_\_\_\_\_

**KNOWLEDGE**

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Description \_\_\_\_\_

Examples \_\_\_\_\_

**PERFORMANCE**

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Description \_\_\_\_\_

Examples \_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL RATING**

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Evaluator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

PH:mr  
11/22/65

**SANTA MONICA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Santa Monica, California**

**PROBATIONARY TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT**

**FALL SEMESTER (Short Form)**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Grade, Subject Field, or Department \_\_\_\_\_

Number in Class or Average Number in Classes \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Years of Teaching in Santa Monica \_\_\_\_\_ Probationary Year \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Years of Teaching \_\_\_\_\_

**STRENGTHS:**

**IMPROVEMENT NEEDED:**

Visits requested of Central Office (indicate person or persons requested)

Signed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal or President Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director of Education or School Administrator Date \_\_\_\_\_

**TEACHER'S COMMENTS:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature of teacher does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that report has been read.)

FAZ:cb  
11-15-60

CLASSROOM VISITATION

EVALUATIONS

**BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE**  
**REPORT ON CLASS VISIT**

It is hoped that this brief report will help determine systematically and at appropriate times the accomplishments of our probationary instructors.

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Visit \_\_\_\_\_

Class Visited \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Lecture \_\_\_\_\_ Laboratory \_\_\_\_\_

Comment on the following:

1. Preparation and presentation of material \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Student-teacher relations \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Other observations \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Visit made by \_\_\_\_\_

## CHADOT COLLEGE

REPORT OF CLASS VISIT  
(Division Chairmen)

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Date of report \_\_\_\_\_

Course \_\_\_\_\_

Length of visit \_\_\_\_\_

Time \_\_\_\_\_

Date of visit \_\_\_\_\_

Topic, content of subject matter and significance of material:

---

---

---

Preparation for this session:

---

---

---

Relevancy to course objectives:

---

---

---

Presentation: logic followed, clarity, level of interest and vitality:

---

---

---

**Response to and from students:**

---

---

---

**General evaluation of this visit:**

---

---

---

**Other points:**

---

---

---

**Suggestions:**

---

---

---

**I have received and read this report.**

**Instructor's signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Administrator's signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of consultation** \_\_\_\_\_

**Form #1  
JM:sm  
10/9/63**

## CHABOT COLLEGE

**REPORT OF CLASS VISIT**  
(Deans, Assistant Deans)

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

---

**Instructor**


---

**Date of report**


---

**Course**


---

**Length of visit**


---

**Time**


---

**Date of visit**

- #1 Shows outstanding strength
- #2 Meets Chabot College standards of strong performance
- #3 Needs improvement
- #4 Below Chabot College standards

**Evaluation:**
☐
**Topic, command of subject matter and significance of material:**


---



---



---

☐
**Preparation for this session:**


---



---



---

☐
**Relevancy to course objectives:**


---



---



---

☐
**Presentation: logic followed, clarity, level of interest and vitality:**


---



---



---

☐

Response to and from students:

---



---



---

☐

General Evaluation of this visit:

---



---



---

Other Points:

---



---



---

Suggestions:

---



---



---

I have received and read this report.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Instructor's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of consultation

Form #2  
JN:mm  
10-9-63

## REPORT OF CLASS VISIT

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

---

**Instructor**

---

**Date of report**

---

**Course**

---

**Length of visit**

---

**Time**

---

**Date of visit****Organization and Control:**

---

---

---

**Topic; relevancy to the course objectives:**

---

---

---

**Presentation; student response:**

---

---

---

**General evaluation of this visit:**

---

---

---

---

---

**Suggestions:**

---

---

---

**I have received and read this report.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Instructor's signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Administrator's signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date of consultation**

**Form #3**  
**JW:m**  
**3-18-64**

# **CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORT**

Name of Instructor Visited: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. & No. of Course \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Visit \_\_\_\_\_ Class Hour \_\_\_\_\_ Length of Visit \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: (use by observer is optional) \_\_\_\_\_ Lecture \_\_\_\_\_ Question-Answer  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Recitation \_\_\_\_\_ Discussion \_\_\_\_\_ Audio-Visual

Other comments of techniques used, if appropriate:

## **OBSERVATION CHECK-LIST (use by observer is optional):**

- Presents subject matter clearly \_\_\_\_\_
- Employs means to make materials interesting \_\_\_\_\_
- Appears to motivate students to further study \_\_\_\_\_
- Appears to promote a feeling of friendliness \_\_\_\_\_
- Appears enthusiastic in presentation \_\_\_\_\_
- Handles classroom discipline and organization well \_\_\_\_\_
- Is sensitive to appropriate physical conditions within classroom \_\_\_\_\_
- Instructor's personal grooming appears to be satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_
- Instructor's health appears to be satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5

Meaning of Ranking: 1—Excellent; 2—Superior; 3—Average; 4—Below Average; 5—Poor

EVALUATION (observer will express, in paragraph style, his evaluation of the instructor's teaching during this particular class visit; it will represent his professional judgment):

## **RECOMMENDATIONS OF OBSERVER TO THE INSTRUCTOR:**

The above evaluation represents my best professional judgment:

Signature of observer \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

I have had the opportunity to read this report and discuss it with the observer (written comments may be made on the other side of the sheet if the instructor desires):

Signature of instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Distribution: Original to administrative office file; copies to observer's and instructor's files.